

**REMARKS**

This is in full and timely response to the Office Action mailed on September 13, 2010.

Claims 1-15 are currently pending in this application, with claims 1, 8 and 15 being independent. *No new matter has been added.*

Reexamination in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

***Entry of amendment is respectfully requested***

This Amendment *prima facie* places the case in condition for allowance.

Alternatively, it places this case in better condition for appeal.

***New non-final Office Action is respectfully requested***

At least for the following reasons, if the allowance of the claims is not forthcoming at the very least and a new ground of rejection made, then a ***new non-final Office Action*** is respectfully requested.

***Prematureness***

Applicant, seeking review of the *prematureness* of the final rejection within the Final Office Action, respectfully requests reconsideration of the finality of the Final Office Action for the reasons set forth hereinbelow. See M.P.E.P. §706.07(c).

**Claim rejections**

**i. U.S. Patent No. 6,381,562 (Keane).**

**A. Keane fails to disclose, teach, or suggest *two or more different simulator part devices*.**

The claims as finally rejected include two or more different simulator part devices that calculate the behavior of an organism's structural elements, which are the elements making up the organism.

However, the Office Action fails to show two or more different simulator part devices within Keane.

**B. Keane fails to disclose, teach, or suggest *simulation scenario information*.**

Keane fails to disclose, teach, or suggest *information on a flow of data between the two or more simulator parts and the data output part, and an operation sequence thereof*.

Pages 4-5 of the Office Action refer to Figure 2 of Keane for simulators in parallel.

However, column 7, lines 40-41, of Keane refers to Figure 2 as a "flowchart" and not for simulators in parallel.

Thus, Keane fails to disclose, teach, or suggest simulation scenario information.

**C. Keane fails to disclose, teach, or suggest *receiving data from a user and/or the simulation controller*.**

Page 5 of the Office Action readily admits that Keane fails to disclose an input data reception unit.

Thus, Keane fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the claim 1 input data reception unit for receiving data from a user and/or the simulation controller.

Likewise, Keane fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the claim 8 input data reception step of receiving data from a user and/or the simulation control program.

Keane fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the claim 15 input data reception unit for receiving data from a user and/or the simulation control device.

**D. Keane fails to disclose, teach, or suggest *receiving output data from the simulation controller*.**

Page 5 of the Office Action readily admits that Keane fails to disclose an output data output unit.

Thus, Keane fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the claim 1 output data output unit for transferring the output data to the simulation controller.

Likewise, Keane fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the claim 8 output data output step of transferring the output data to the simulation control program.

Keane fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the claim 15 output data output unit for sending the output data to the simulation control device.

**E. Keane fails to disclose, teach, or suggest *transferring the data received by the data reception unit to the simulator parts based on the simulation scenario information.***

Page 5 of the Office Action readily admits that Keane fails to disclose an input data transfer unit.

Thus, Keane fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the claim 1 input data transfer unit for transferring the data received by the data reception unit to the simulator parts based on the simulation scenario information.

Likewise, Keane fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the claim 8 input data transfer step of transferring the data received by the data reception step to the simulator programs based on simulation scenario information that is stored.

Keane fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the claim 15 input data transfer unit for sending the data received by the data reception unit to the simulator part devices based on the simulation scenario information.

**F. Keane fails to disclose, teach, or suggest *transferring the data that have been received from the two or more simulator parts to the data output part based on the simulation scenario information.***

Page 5 of the Office Action readily admits that Keane fails to disclose an output data transfer unit.

Thus, Keane fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the claim 1 an output data transfer unit for transferring the data that have been received from the two or more simulator parts to the data output part based on the simulation scenario information.

Likewise, Keane fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the claim 8 output data transfer step of transferring the data that have been received from the two or more simulator programs to the data output program based on the simulation scenario information.

Keane fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the claim 15 output data transfer unit for sending the data that have been received from the two or more simulator part devices to the data output part device based on the simulation scenario information.

**ii. U.S. Patent No. 4,862,347 (Rudy).**

Page 5 of the Office Action readily admits that Rudy fails to disclose, teach, or suggest an input data reception unit.

Furthermore, page 5 of the Office Action readily admits that Rudy fails to disclose, teach, or suggest an output data reception unit.

**iii. U.S. Patent No. 5,408,623 (Dolidon).**

Dolidon fails to disclose, teach, or suggest two or more different simulator part devices that calculate the behavior of an organism's structural elements, which are the elements making up the organism.

Thus, Dolidon fails to remedy the deficiencies identified within Keane and Rudy.

**iv. U.S. Patent No. 6,857,878 (Chosack).**

Chosack *fails* to disclose, teach, or suggest two or more different simulator part devices that calculate the behavior of an organism's structural elements, which are the elements making up the organism.

Thus, Chosack *fails* to remedy the deficiencies identified within Keane, Rudy and Dolidon.

**v. Combination of the references.**

The point of novelty of this application is that “*data flow and simulation scenario information between multiple simulator parts and data output part are totally separated from operation programs or a specially designed circuit.*”

Since simulation scenario information is necessary to be changed time to time according to progress of scientific research, the simulation scenario information is totally separated from process parts of a simulation processing parts of a simulation device, such as, input data transfer part and output data transfer part).

None of the references discloses these features.

In particular, in Keane, the information that could be the simulation information of this application is considered to constitute a part of the processing part and to be buried in the processing part. None of the references suggests how to combine to arrive at the claimed invention of amended claim 1.

**Official Notice**

There is no concession as to the veracity of Official Notice, if taken in any Office Action.

An affidavit or document should be provided in support of any Official Notice taken. 37 C.F.R. §1.104(d)(2), M.P.E.P. § 2144.03. See also, *Ex parte Natale*, 11 USPQ2d 1222, 1227-1228 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1989)(failure to provide any objective evidence to support the challenged use of Official Notice constitutes clear and reversible error).

**Extensions of time**

Please treat any concurrent or future reply, requiring a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge all required fees, fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.17, or all required extension of time fees.

**Fees-general authorization**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees filed, asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm).

If any fee is required or any overpayment made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee or credit the overpayment to Deposit Account # 18-0013.

## **Conclusion**

This response is believed to be a complete response to the Office Action.

Applicants reserve the right to set forth further arguments supporting the patentability of their claims, including the separate patentability of the dependent claims not explicitly addressed herein, in future papers.

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are allowable, and the present application is in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the application in light of the remarks is courteously solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone Brian K. Dutton, Reg. No. 47,255, at 202-955-8753.

Dated: December 2, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Brian K. Dutton

Registration No.: 47,255

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

Correspondence Customer Number: 23353

Attorney for Applicant